



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,236	07/31/2003	Joshua S. Allen	RSW920030080US1	2538
45541 7590 09/18/2007 HOFFMAN WARNICK & DALESSANDRO LLC 75 STATE ST 14TH FLOOR ALBANY, NY 12207			EXAMINER WAI, ERIC CHARLES	
			ART UNIT 2195	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/18/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/632,236	Applicant(s) ALLEN, JOSHUA S.	
	Examiner Eric C. Wai	Art Unit 2195	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-17 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-5, and 10-17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. The following terms are not clearly understood:
 - i. Claims 1, 10, and 14 recite, "wherein the adding is performed through a separate web application having a duty to serve the resource". It is unclear whether the "separate web application" is the same as the "at least web application" or the "resource lookup web application" or a separate application entirely.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

Art Unit: 2195

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Beadle et al. (US Pat No. 6,766,373 hereinafter Beadle).

6. Regarding claim 6, AAPA teaches a method comprising:

dynamically adding a Java resource to at least one web application in a web application server without having to restart the web application ([0002] lines 1-3).

7. AAPA does not explicitly teach that the dynamically adding of a resource occurs without losing session information in the web application or that the adding is performed through a separate web application having a duty to serve the resource. Beadle teaches a system that would allow users to be switched over to other connections (i.e. resources) without losing session information (col 2 lines 39-47).

8. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to include dynamically adding without losing session information. It is well known in the art that losing session information is unwanted behavior and such an improvement would be welcomed as evidenced by Beadle (col 2 lines 45-46). One would be motivated by the desire to be able to add resources in real-time without disrupting end users. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, that the adding is performed through a separate web application. AAPA indicates that when a web application adds resources, session information is lost ([0002] lines 3-4). One would be motivated by the desire to ensure

Art Unit: 2195

the integrity of user session information when such resources are added to reduce system down time.

9. Regarding claim 7, AAPA teaches that the Java resource comprises a Java ResourceBundle ([0003]).

10. Regarding claim 8, AAPA teaches the Java resource is selected from the group consisting of a new Java resource and an updated Java resource ([0019]).

11. Claims 1-5, and 9-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) and Beadle et al. (US Pat No. 6,766,373), further in view of Tyrell, III (US Pat No. 7,062,527 hereinafter Tyrell).

12. Regarding claim 9, AAPA teach the method comprising:

detecting an availability of the Java resource (wherein it is inherent that the resource must be available before it can be allocated);

receiving a request for the Java resource from the web application (wherein it is inherent that the application requests the resource either directly or indirectly); and

providing the Java resource to the web application ([0002]).

Art Unit: 2195

13. AAPA does not teach the use of a resource lookup web application or the step of installing the Java resource and, once installed, advertising the Java resource to the web application.

14. However, Tyrell teaches a server that periodically checks resource information and notifies hosts of any changes that may have occurred (col 13 lines 12-25). In the system of Tyrell, the resources are pooled together and the status is updated in a database (col 13 lines 26-31). Tyrell teaches that his system would be useful in an environment where servers are constantly starting up and shutting down.

15. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a resource lookup application. One would be motivated by the desire to have a centralized database for checking the status of resource availability. It would have also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to install and advertise resources to web applications. One would have been motivated by the desire to notify the applications of changing resource availability as evidenced by Tyrell.

16. Regarding claims 1-4, they are the rejected for the same reasons as claims 6-9 above.

17. Regarding claim 5, AAPA teaches installing the resource into the resource lookup web application causes the resource lookup web application to lose session information ([0002]).

Art Unit: 2195

18. Regarding claims 10-17, they are the system and program product claims of claims 6-9 above. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 6-9 above.

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant's arguments filed 6/22/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

20. However, Examiner made typographical errors when citing Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). Rejections under 35 USC § 103 have been clarified.

21. Applicant argues that Beadle's method "is not equivalent to the claimed invention" by teaching "re-routing ... of session from the first connection route to the second ... " and not "adding the resource to each requesting web application".

22. Beadle was cited to indicate that it is well known in the art that losing session information is highly unwanted behavior. AAPA was cited to indicate that the step of dynamically adding JAVA resources appears in the prior art.

Conclusion

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric C. Wai whose telephone number is 571-270-1012. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs, 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng - Ai An can be reached on 571-272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

EW


MENG-AI T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100